REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11-16, and 18-28 are presented for examination. All claims were rejected. Claims 4, 5 and 9 have been cancelled. Claim 21 has been added. Claims 1, 8, 12 and 22 are currently amended. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 8 distinguish the cited references because a SCSI memory is in communication with a power integrated Ethernet network via a SEP control module. Ishida (Fig. 1) and ATX (Fig. 3) teach that the storage and the network controller are interconnected by a PCI bus. The presently claimed invention employs a controller which more directly links a SCSI storage device with a power integrated Ethernet network. In particular, claim 1 recites "a SCSI memory configured to store data; a SCSI Encapsulation Protocol control module coupled to the memory, the control module for controlling the transmission of data from the memory to the power integrated network and the storage of data received from the power integrated network in the memory." Similarly, claim 8 recites "coupling a SCSI data storage device to the power integrated Ethernet network, the SCSI data storage device configured to communicate with the power integrated Ethernet network via a SCSI Encapsulation Protocol control module." Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 8 is in the specification at page 8, lines 1-12. For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 8 is requested. Claims 2, 3, 7, and 11 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention and are allowable for the same reason as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2, 3, 7, and 11 is therefore also requested.

Claim 12 distinguishes the cited references because local storage devices associated with different power integrated networks are interconnected via a non-power integrated network. For example, the storage devices may be associated with different power integrated Ether net

networks which are interconnected via the Internet. In contrast, the cited references, Ishida in particular at Fig. 1, teaches a conventional RAID configuration in which the disks are connected to a RAID controller. Such RAID controllers often utilize a SCSI protocol having relatively limited signal reach. Consequently, the disks may be in close physical proximity. Such a RAID offers protection from failure of a disk, but not destruction of the entire array due to events such as building fires. In contrast, the presently claimed configuration facilitates implementation of a RAID in which significant geographical distance separates the data storage. Hence, the destruction of one site due to an event such as fire does not necessarily destroy all data storage associated with the RAID. For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested. Claims 13-16, and 18-28 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reason as claim 12. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 13-16 and 18-28 is therefore also requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

January 25, 2005
Date

Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-167
Dd: 2/17/2005